

UDK 811.16*344.34(091)

Stručni rad

Rukopis primljen 17. III. 2014.

Prihvaćen za tisak 23. V. 2014.

Frederik Kortlandt

Department of comparative linguistics

Leiden University

P.O. Box 9515

NL-2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

www.kortlandt.nl

ON THE ACCENTUATION OF *NESLB* AND RELATED ISSUES

In a recent article of major importance (2013), Tijmen Pronk has treated the accentuation of *l*-participles of the type *neslb* in western South Slavic. Pronk points out correctly that Dybo's law did not shift the accent onto final jers, e.g. in **kònb*, **bònb*, and that the short vowel was preserved in Slovak *osem* < **òsmb*, *oheñ* < **ògnb*, *mohol* < **mòglb*. Contrary to what Pronk claims, Slovene *něsəl* is the phonetic reflex of **nēsłb* < **neslb*, Slovak *niesol*. The Slovene doublets (v) *ôgəl* < **ôglb* and (v) *ózəl* < **ôzlb* suggest an earlier paradigm with *vô-* < *ô-* in the nom.sg. form and *ó-* < **ô-* in the oblique cases. The vowel of *ôganj* < **ôgnb* also stems from the oblique cases. The expected neo-circumflex in the nom.sg. form is actually attested in *rěbər* < **rèbrb* beside *rěbər* with the reflex of Stang's law from the oblique cases. There is no reason to assume that the accent was not retracted at an early stage in **neslb*, nor is there any reason to assume that Dybo's law shifted the accent to the final jer in **dòbrb* and **sèdmb*, as Pronk claims.

In a recent article of major importance (2013), Tijmen Pronk has treated the accentuation of *l*-participles of the type *neslb* in western South Slavic. Since the author refers to several earlier views which I no longer hold, it is appropriate that I specify the points where his analysis is at variance with my present views. Here I shall follow the order in which they appear in the text of his article.

Pronk points out correctly that Dybo's law did not shift the accent onto final jers, e.g. in **kònb*, **bònb*. The retraction of the accent from a stressed jer in mobile accent paradigms yielded a long vowel, e.g. gen.pl. Slovene *nóg*, Polish

raq, which later spread analogically to other accent paradigms. The long vowel which we find in nom.sg. Czech *kůň*, Slovak *kôň*, Ukrainian *kin'*, Russian dial. *kôn'*, Slovak *bôb*, Ukrainian *bib* etc. is the result of later innovations. As Pronk points out, the short vowel was preserved in Slovak *osem* < **òsm̥*, *ohēñ* < **ògñ̥*, *mohol* < **mògl̥*. I cannot accept the hypothesis that the lengthening in such instances as Czech *kůň* 'horse', *stůl* 'table', *nůž* 'knife', Slovak *kôň*, *stól*, *nôž* is the result of phonetic conditioning because the number of counter-examples is prohibitive (e.g. Nonnenmacher-Pribić 1961: 94). More probably, the long vowel was adopted from the case forms where the accent had been retracted as a result of Stang's law, viz. loc.sg. **kôñi*, inst.pl. **kôñi*, loc.pl. **kôñix*, and from gen.pl. **kôñ*, Slovene *kôñju*, *kôñji*, *kôñjih*, *kôñj*, so as to yield a regular alternation between stressed **ô* and unstressed **o* in the paradigm. After the retraction of the stress in gen.sg. **koña*, dat.sg. **koñu*, inst.sg. **koñem*, nom.pl. **koñi*, acc.pl. **koñe*, dat.pl. **koñem*, and perhaps after the shortening of **ô* to **ò* before the new long case endings in gen.pl. *-ôv*, *-i* and loc.pl. *-iech*, *-ich*, the paradigm could be further regularized by generalization of the short root vowel, a process which has been going on in historical times, e.g. Czech *skot* 'cattle', Old Czech *skót* (see further Kortlandt 2011: 346). In Russian, short rising vowels were lengthened e.g. dial. *kôn'* < **kōñ* < **kòñ̥*. In Ukrainian, short vowels were lengthened in monosyllables, e.g. *kin'* < **kōñ* < **kòñ̥*.

Pronk writes that the long falling vowel which lost the accent in accordance with Stang's law was not shortened in Lechitic, e.g. in Old Polish *wolâ*, *woniâ*, *rolâ*, *suszâ*. This is not correct because we find in Slovincian both *vùolâ* and *vùola*, *vùonja*, *rolâu* and *rùola*, *cažâu* and *sušâu* beside *cenjâu* and *močâu*. There evidently was before Stang's law a confusion between the flexion types of Old Polish *wolâ*, *rolâ* < *-â and *lodziâ*, *sędziâ* < *-bjâ after contraction in the latter ending and loss of distinctive tone in this area (cf. Kortlandt 2014). I find no dialectal differences in the operation of either Dybo's law or Stang's law.

The Slovene neo-circumflex originated before a non-final weak jer (which was lost) and before a long vowel in the following syllable (which was shortened), e.g. *bítka* < **bìt̥ka*, *osnôva* < **osnòvā*. We also find a neo-circumflex in *kâzan* < **kâzn̥*, (v) *ôgal* < **ôgl̥*, *vêtar* < **vèt̥r̥*, *mîsəl* < **mỳsl̥*, but not in (v) *ôzal* < **ôzl̥*, *ôganj* < **ôgñ̥*. Pronk assumes that the loss of the final jer regularly gave rise to the neo-circumflex here because the jer was preserved longer after the consonant cluster (thus already Kortlandt 2011: 52). I no longer think that this is the correct explanation. Since the Proto-Slavic accent was a purely tonal feature, it is improbable that it had any influence on the development of a final jer. When the latter lost its accentuability, it is improbable that this

was blocked by a preceding consonant cluster. The rise of an epenthetic vowel which restored the accentuability of the final syllable was a much more recent development which may have taken place after the eventual phonetic loss of final jers in the South Slavic languages. It follows that the neo-circumflex originated from the rise of new consonant clusters rather than from the loss of weak jers. If this is correct, the short vowel in Kajkavian, e.g. *Bednja vèter*, need not be analogical (thus Pronk) but may never have been affected by the rise of the neo-circumflex.

After the rise of the new timbre distinctions, **o* was lengthened by a number of developments which yielded different reflexes in Slovene (successive stages will be numbered in accordance with Kortlandt 2011: 170–174 and 304–308):

- retraction of the stress from final jers (8.2), e.g. gen.pl. *gór*, *óvæc*,
- lengthening of short falling vowels in monosyllables (8.8), e.g. *bôg*, *kôst*,
- retraction of the stress from long falling vowels in final syllables (Stang's law, 9.3), e.g. *nôsiš*, *vôlja*,
- retraction of the stress from non-final weak jers, e.g. *pôšlješ*, *kônjski*,
- progressive accent shift (10.7), e.g. *okô*, *mladôst*,
- rise of the neo-circumflex (10.9), e.g. *osnôva*, *podôba*,
- retraction of the stress from final short vowels (10.12), e.g. *gôra*, *ókno*.

In the language of the Freising manuscripts, the retraction of the stress from non-final jers was under way, as is clear from the forms **(na)zodni** *sôdñī* (2×) beside **(na)zudinem** *sôdñēm* and **bozzledine** *poslēdñē*. Stang's law was earlier, as is clear from **-u** for posttonic *-*o* in **vuolu** (2×), **vuoliu**, **vueliu**, and the progressive accent shift was later, as is similarly clear from **dušu** (2×), **choku**, **chocu**, **pomngu** (2×), **tuoriv** (2×), which have preserved the original Proto-Slavic accentuation (cf. Kortlandt 2011: 59–65 and 211–222).

Since desinential stress in the gen.pl. form and a falling tone on the initial syllable were limited to accent paradigm (c) whereas fixed stress on the second syllable before Stang's law was a result of Dybo's law and therefore characteristic of accent paradigm (b), there is a clear correlation between Slovene *o* and *ô* on the one hand and accent paradigms (c) and (b) on the other. Regularization in derived formations gave rise to generalization of one or the other, e.g. *dobrôta*, *golôta*, *mokrôta* (Valjavec), *novôta*, *ostrôta*, *rabôta* (Pleteršnik) with *ô* for *ô* from the acc.sg. form of *lepôta*, *junôta*, *nagôta*, *prostôta*, *tegôta*, *mokróta* (Pleteršnik), *sirôta* (cf. Dybo 1968: 162 and 1981: 124). Note that *perje*, *zêlje*, *kôzji* did not undergo Stang's law (thus Pronk) but retracted the stress from the lost jer, just as *pôšlješ*, *kônjski* and *žênski*.

While lengthened **o* is reflected as *o* or *ȯ* in Slovene, lengthened **e* is always reflected as *ė*, whereas *ė* reflects earlier *jat* (except before **r*, e.g. *věra*, *měra*). It follows that *něsāl* is the phonetic reflex of **nēs̥l̥b* < **nesl̥b̃*, similarly *rěkal*, *pěkal*, *těkal*, Slovak *niesol*, *riekol*. In the adjective, Slovene *dōbār*, *mōkār*, *ōstār* adopted the vowel of the definite form, where it originated from Stang's law, like *sēdām* and *ōsām* from *sēdmi* and *ōsmi*, cf. Slovak *osem* versus *ōsmŷ*, where the original vocalism has been preserved. The Slovene doublets (*v*)*ōgāl* < **ōgl̥b* and (*v*)*ōzāl* < **ōzl̥b* suggest an earlier paradigm with *vō̇* < *ō̇*- in the nom.sg. form and *ó-* < **ō̇-* in the oblique cases. The vowel of *ōgānj* < **ōgñb* and *tōpāl* (Pleteršnik) also stems from the oblique cases. The expected neo-circumflex in the nom.sg. form is actually attested in *rēbār* (Valjavec) < **rēbr̥b* (b) beside *rēbār* 'slope' (Pleteršnik, who also gives *vřēbār*) with the reflex of Stang's law from the oblique cases (cf. Kortlandt 2011: 341). There is no reason to assume that the accent was not retracted at an early stage in **nesl̥b̃*, nor is there any reason to assume that Dybo's law shifted the accent to the final jer in **dōbr̥b* and **sēdm̥b*, as Pronk claims. In fact, the neo-circumflex in *rēbār* shows the regular development. The short vowel in the reflex of **nēs̥l̥b* in most South Slavic dialects is evidently analogical because this was the only form with a long vowel in the paradigm.

References:

- DYBO, VLADIMIR A. 1968. Akcentologija i slovoobrazovanie v slavjanskom. *Slavjanskoe jazykoznanie: VI meždunarodnyj s'ezd slavistov*, Praga, 1968. Nauka. Moskva. 148–224.
- DYBO, VLADIMIR A. 1981. *Slavjanskaja akcentologija*. Nauka. Moskva.
- NONNENMACHER-PRIBIĆ, ELISABETH. 1961. *Die baltoslavischen Akzent- und Intonationsverhältnisse und ihr quantitativer Reflex im Slavischen*. Harrassowitz. Wiesbaden.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2011. *Selected writings on Slavic and general linguistics*. Rodopi. Amsterdam.
- KORTLANDT, FREDERIK. 2014. Proto-Slavic **j*, Van Wijk's law, and *ē*-stems. Paper presented at the 9th IWoBA (Pula 2013).
- PRONK, TIJMEN. 2013. On the accentuation of *l*-participles of the type *nesl̥b* in western South Slavic. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 39/1. 105–131.

O akcentuaciji pridjeva tipa *neslъ* i povezanim problemima

Sažetak

U nedavno objavljenome važnom članku (2013.) Tijmen Pronk obradio je akcentuaciju zapadnojužnoslavenskih pridjeva radnih tipa *neslъ*. Pronk ispravno ističe da Diboov zakon nije pomaknuo naglasak na finalne poluglase, npr. **kòŋъ*, **bòbъ*, i da je kratki samoglasnik sačuvan u Slovačkom *osem* < **òsmъ*, *oheň* < **ògŋъ*, *mohol* < **mòglъ*. Suprotno onome što Pronk tvrdi, slavenski je *něsəl* fonetski refleks **nēsłъ* < **nesłъ*, slovački *niesol*. Slavenske dublete (*v*) *ôgəl* < **òglъ* i (*v*) *ózəl* < **òzlъ* upućuju na postojanje ranije paradigme sa *vô-* < *ô-* u Njd i *ó-* < **ò-* u kosim padežima. Samoglasnik u *ôgəŋj* < **ògŋъ* također dolazi iz kosih padeža. Očekivani neocirkumfleks u Njd zapravo je potvrđen u *rěbər* < **rèbrъ* uz *rěbər* s odrazom Stangova zakona iz kosih padeža. Nema razloga pretpostaviti da naglasak nije povučen u ranoj fazi u **nesłъ*, kao ni to da je Diboov zakon pomaknuo naglasak na finalni poluglas u **dòbrъ* i **sèdmъ*, kao što Pronk tvrdi.

Ključne riječi: akcentuacija, glagolski pridjev radni, Diboov zakon, Stangov zakon, neocirkumfleks

Key words: accentuation, l-participle, Dybo's law, Stang's law, neo-circumflex.

